

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 were rejected. By the present Response, claims 9, 13 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-10, 13-18, and 24-25 will be pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koritzinsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,598,011, hereinafter "Koritzinsky"). The Office Action does not explicitly reject claims 13-18 and 24-25. However, the Office Action mentions claims 13-18 and 24-25 under the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-10. Therefore, Applicants assume that claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-18 and 24-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Koritzinsky.

Applicants have reviewed Koritzinsky, which is commonly assigned with the present application. Indeed, Applicants are well aware of how the Koritzinsky system operates, but did not previously regard Koritzinsky as relevant. The Koritzinsky system very successfully responded to a need in the industry for communicating a service request to a service provider, particularly in the medical systems industry. However, the system was based upon generating a request by the user. It was not configured to automatically copy portions of examination and series data from an event log and produce a reduced data set event log. To the best of the Applicants' knowledge, Koritzinsky does not disclose the subject matter of the present claims for the reasons cited below.

Claims 1 and 24 recite, among other things, automatically copying portion of examination and series data from an event log to produce a reduced data set event log. Claims 9 and 13, recite, among other things, producing a reduced data set event log based on the detection of predetermined conditions. Claim 18 recites a means for receiving an event log from an input device and means for producing a reduced data set event log based on the

based on the detection of predetermined conditions. At least these recitations are not taught by Koritzinsky.

Koritzinsky does not teach, suggest or disclose automatically copying portion of examination and series data from an event log to produce a reduced data set event log. Further, Koritzinsky does not teach, suggest or disclose producing a reduced data set event log based on the detection of predetermined conditions. Koritzinsky discloses a uniform graphical user interface that facilitates formulation of service requests and enables system designers to permit such service requests in a similar manner across several diagnostic system modalities. A "snap shot" or current system state may be captured as the basis for the service request. The service request page would be accessed from the normal operating page at the scanner. With the system state remaining at its condition just prior to accessing the service request page, image data files, log files, error files, and so forth may be identified, captured, stored and transmitted to the service facility for evaluation of potential problems in the diagnostic system (*See*, FIG. 8 and column 13, lines 18-47). This "snap shot" is not, however, automatically created absent the user-composed service request.

Clearly, Koritzinsky does not teach, suggest or disclose automatically copying portions of examination and series data from an event log to produce a reduced data set event log based on the detection of predetermined conditions. On the contrary, the present invention may monitor the event log on a line-by-line basis for certain predetermined conditions and then reduces the event log based on the predetermine conditions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 13, 18 and 24 and claims depending therefrom are allowable and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koritzinsky. The claim rejected under this section depends indirectly from independent claim 1. Koritzinsky is not believed to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of independent claim 1. Consequently, dependent claim 6 is believed to be patentable both by virtue of its dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter it separately recites. Reconsideration and allowance of dependent claim 6 on this basis are requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/4/2006

79
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545